

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 26-28, 33-46, 306, 307, and 309-312 are pending with entry of this amendment, claims 309-312 being added herein, claims 1, 3-10, 13-19, 21-25, 29-32, 47-56, 61, 304, 305, and 308 being cancelled herein and claims 2, 11-12, 20, 57-60, and 62-303 having been cancelled previously. Claims 26-28 and 33-35 are amended herein. These amendments introduce no new matter and support is replete throughout the specification. These amendments are made without prejudice to renewal of the claims in their original form and are not to be construed as abandonment or dedication of the previously claimed subject matter or agreement with any objection or rejection of record.

Claims 26, 28, 33, and 35, which were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, have been rewritten accordingly. Since each of these claims either was dependent on a multiply dependent claim or was multiply dependent itself, to avoid confusion only one of the two alternatives has been specified in amended claim 26, 28, 33, or 35 and the other alternative has been specified in corresponding new claim 309, 310, 311, or 312, respectively, as follows.

Claim 26 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims 25 and 21. (Claim 25 formerly depended from claims 21 and 304 in the alternative.) New claim 309, identical to claim 26 rewritten to include the limitations of claims 25 and 304, has been introduced. Claim 27 has been amended accordingly, to depend from amended claim 26 or new claim 309.

Claim 28 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims 25 and 21. New claim 310, identical to claim 28 rewritten to include the limitations of claims 25 and 304, has been introduced.

Claim 33 formerly depended from claims 29 and 305 in the alternative. Claim 33 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 29. New claim 311, identical to claim 33 rewritten to include the limitations of claim 305, has been introduced. Claim 34 has been amended accordingly, to depend from amended claim 33 or new claim 311.

Claim 35 formerly depended from claims 29 and 305 in the alternative. Claim 35 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 29. New claim 312, identical to claim 35 rewritten to include the limitations of claim 305, has been introduced.

Support for the amendments can be found, e.g., in the claims as filed.

Applicants submit that no new matter has been added to the application by way of the above claim amendments, which merely rewrite claims in independent form. Accordingly, entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

The action of April 15, 2008 included: rejections for alleged obviousness (items 2-5), indication of allowable subject matter (items 6-7), and objections to the claims (item 7). Applicants traverse all rejections, to the extent that they may be applied to the amended claims, for the reasons noted herein.

#### OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 26-28 and 33-35 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As noted above, claims 26, 28, 33 and 35 have been amended and claims 309-312 have been introduced accordingly. Applicants therefore respectfully request the objections be withdrawn.

#### THE CLAIMS, AS AMENDED, ARE ALLOWABLE

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. The Action indicated that claims 36-46, 306, and 307 are allowed and that claims 26-28 and 33-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 26-28 and 33-35 have been rewritten accordingly, as noted above. In addition, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants have cancelled all claims not indicated as allowed or allowable, rendering the above-noted rejections moot. However, Applicants do not concede to the Examiner's rejections and note they may file a continuation to pursue the cancelled claims. These amendments are therefore made without prejudice to renewal of the

Appl. No. 10/716,174  
Amdt. Dated 9/15/2008  
Reply to Office action of April 15, 2008

claims in their original form and are not to be construed as abandonment or dedication of the previously claimed subject matter or agreement with any objection or rejection of record.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the claims are deemed not to be in condition for allowance after consideration of this Response, a telephone interview with the Examiner is hereby requested. Please telephone Monica Elrod-Erickson at (510) 337-7871 to schedule an interview.

QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP  
P.O. BOX 458, Alameda, CA 94501  
Tel: 510 337-7871  
Fax: 510 337-7877  
PTO Customer No.: 22798  
Deposit Account No.: 50-0893

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Littlepage  
Reg No. 48,581  
For Monica Elrod-Erickson  
Reg. No. 51,651

#### Attachments:

- 1) A petition to extend the period of response for two months;
- 2) A transmittal sheet;
- 3) A fee transmittal sheet; and
- 4) A receipt indication postcard.